

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at CSU Bakersfield

March 5, 2008

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at CSU Bakersfield. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the attached report, the accreditation recommendation is Accreditation.

Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions For all Programs offered by the Institution or Program Sponsor

NCATE/Common Standards

	NCATE Level	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Initial Advanced	X X		
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Initial Advanced	X X		
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Initial Advanced	X X		
4) Diversity	Initial Advanced	X X		
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Initial Advanced	X X		
6) Unit Governance and Resources	Initial Advanced	X X		

The state decisions on NCATE/Common Standards concurred with the NCATE recommendation for all standards except Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources. The state decision on Standard 6 is **Met with Concerns**.

Program Standards

	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Multiple Subject	19	19	-	-
Single Subject	19	14	5	-
Education Specialist: MM Level I	17	17	-	-
Ed Specialist: MS Level I	19	19	-	-
Education Specialist: MM Level II	12	12	-	-
Education Specialist: MS Level II	11	10	1	-
Reading Certificate	11	11	-	-
Reading Specialist Credential	9	9	-	-
Administrative Services-Level I	15	15	-	-
Administrative Services-Level II	9	9	-	-
PPS-School Counseling	32	32	-	-
Health: School Nurse	29	29	-	-

The following activities were completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: CSU Bakersfield

Dates of Visit: March 1-5, 2008

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of Accreditation was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. Not all information was immediately available and multiple requests had to be submitted. Some data analysis was also left to the team. Ultimately, the team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards— The recommendations of the team regarding the six NCATE standards are Met at both the initial and advanced levels. With respect to the California Team Decisions, NCATE Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources differs from the NCATE recommendation in that the team decision is Met with Concerns. The concerns are focused on the areas of leadership and coordination in two of the programs: Single Subject and Education Specialist, and advisement in the same two programs.

Program Standards – The team found that all programs, other than the Single Subject and Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Level I and Moderate/Severe Level II programs met all program standards. In these three programs a total of eight standards are met with concerns. The quality of the candidates from CSUB is not in question, but there are areas where fine tuning of the structures and procedures will improve the cohesive delivery of the two programs.

1. Overall Recommendation –The recommendation of the merged team for Accreditation is based on the facts that the CSUB programs are of high quality and are producing effective educators. The standards that are met with concerns are few and the team is confident that the institution will be able to address the concerns effectively.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Multiple Subject Credential
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Multiple Subject BCLAD

Reading and Language Arts
Reading Certificate
Specialist Credential

Single Subject Credential
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

Administrative Services Credential
Preliminary
Preliminary Internship
Professional

Education Specialist Credentials

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
Moderate/Severe Disabilities
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship

Pupil Personnel Services
School Counseling

Professional Level II

Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Moderate/Severe Disabilities

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted
- CSU Bakersfield be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- CSU Bakersfield continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

NCATE Team Leader/Co-Chair:

Nicholas Michelli
City University of New York

California Co-Chair

Judith Maxwell Greig
Notre Dame de Namur University

Common Standards Cluster:

Donald Chu
University of West Florida

Marrienne Coleman
Hueytown High School

Sue George
Missouri State University

Jonathan Gillentine
Rev. Benjamin Parker School

Michael Kotar
CSU Chico

Starla Wierman

Davis Joint Unified School District
Tim Gearheart, Observer
 Lewis Middle School

**Teaching Credential Programs
 Cluster:**

Cindy Grutzik, Cluster Leader
 CSU Dominguez Hills

Bettie Spatafora
 Moreno Valley Unified (Retired)

Lisa Kohne
 Garden Grove Unified School District

Carrie Ann Blackaller
 CSU Dominguez Hills

Melinda Medina
 San Diego Unified School District

Robert Perry
 Los Angeles Unified School District

**Advanced/Services Programs
 Cluster:**

Cynthia Fernandes, Cluster Leader
 Acton Agua Dulce School District

Alex Pulido (Retired)
 CSU Los Angeles

Keyes Kelly
 Arogosy University

Marylin Boring
 Los Angeles Unified School District

Staff to the Accreditation Team

Teri Clark, Administrator
Terry Janicki, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog
 Institutional Self Study
 Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbook
 Follow-up Survey Results
 Course Syllabi
 Information Booklet
 Field Experience Notebook

Candidate Portfolios
 Candidate Work Samples
 Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae
 Faculty Handbook
 Library Holdings
 Program Evaluation Data
 Website

Individuals Interviewed

	Team Leader	Common Standards	Teaching Credential Cluster	Service Credential Cluster	TOTAL

Program Faculty	24	12	60	18	114
Institutional Administration	3	2	13	1	19
Candidates	2	54	240	17	313
Graduates	0	3	98	10	111
Employers of Graduates	0	8	32	4	44
Supervising Practitioners	0	31	41	3	75
Advisors	0	10	35	12	57
School Administrators	0	2	27	8	37
Credential Analysts and Staff	12	2	3	0	17
Advisory Committee	0	15	40	24	79
Placement Coordinator	0	4	1	0	5
TOTAL					871

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

INTRODUCTION

A. The institution

California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB), is a comprehensive public university offering undergraduate, graduate Masters level, and certification. The University opened in September 1970 as the 19th member of the current 23 campus CSU system. CSUB is located on a 375-acre site in metropolitan Bakersfield in the Central Valley area of California, a largely rural area with an economy based on farming and the oil industry.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching currently classifies CSUB as a Master's College and University, large program. Some 7,800 undergraduate and graduate students attend CSUB at either the main campus in Bakersfield or one of the off-campus centers in the Antelope Valley or College of the Canyons. The CSU system is the largest, the most diverse university systems in the country with 417,000 students and 46,000 faculty and staff.

CSUB has four academic schools: Business and Public Administration; Education; Humanities and Social Sciences; and Natural Sciences and Mathematics. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) fully accredits the University, with seven academic programs also accredited by national accrediting organizations.

CSUB offers a range of undergraduate and graduate degrees in the liberal arts, natural sciences, social sciences, and professional fields. The university currently has 36 baccalaureate degrees, 23 master's degrees, 19 certificate programs, and 11 credential programs. In 2005/2006, CSUB granted a total of 1,653 degrees (1,368 bachelor's degrees and 285 master's degrees), the largest number of degrees awarded in CSUB history.

B. The unit

Programs

At the time of the visit, CSUB offered the following credential programs:

The Initial Multiple Subject (Elementary Education) teacher credential program

This program is in the School of Education and although it is offered in multiple pathways, all programs are aligned with one program of study. Programs that are offered off-site include Antelope Valley (AV), Greenfield Union School District (PDS), and the College of the Canyons (COC) cohort at Santa Clarita. The multiple pathways offered include the following:

- Multiple Subject Blended (BBEST)
- Multiple Subject including Internship - Post-baccalaureate (Traditional 5th Year)
- Multiple Subject Bilingual

The Initial Single Subject (Secondary Education) Credential Program. This is one program in the School of Education. There are undergraduate approved subject matter programs in art, English, math, music, physical education, science (biology, chemistry, geo-science, and physics), and Spanish. There is a Single Subject Program offered off-site at the Antelope Valley Campus. The Single Subject program includes the following pathways:

- Single Subject including Internship - Post-baccalaureate (Traditional 5th Year)

Special Education

The initial Special Education teacher credential program is also offered at the Antelope Valley Campus. The Special Education Programs include:

- Education Specialist Level I Mild/Moderate
- Education Specialist Level I Mild/Moderate Internship
- Education Specialist Level I Moderate/Severe
- Education Specialist Level I Moderate/Severe Internship

Advanced Level Programs

At the advanced level, the School of Education offers eight advanced credentials, a Master of Arts in Education with six concentrations, all but two of which include an advanced credential or certification, and a Master of Science in Counseling. All of these are offered through the Department of Teacher Education, the Department of Advanced Educational Studies, or the Department of Special Education.

The advanced credential and certification programs include:

- Administrative Services Tier 1
- Administrative Services Internship
- Administrative Services Tier II
- Pupil Personnel Services/ School Counseling
- Reading Certificate
- Reading Specialist Credential
- School Nurse
- Special Education Level II Mild/Moderate
- Special Education Level II Moderate/Severe

The Master of Arts degree programs include:

- Education Administration
- Bilingual/Multicultural Education
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Early Childhood Education
- Reading/Language Arts
- Special Education

The Master of Science degree program includes:

- Counseling
 - School Counseling
 - Student Affairs

Programs currently offered along with the number of enrolled students, locations (there are three satellite campuses-- Antelope Valley Campus; COC is College of the Canyons Campus; and the Hanford location), and the status of California Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CCTC) approval are summarized in the following chart:

Programs Offered, Level, Candidates, Location, Status of Program Review

Program	Award Level	Program Level	Number of Candidates/ Location*	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	State Approval Status
Multiple Subject including Internship	Credential	Initial	Main - 238 AV - 178 COC - 14	CCTC	Approved
Bilingual Multiple Subject	Credential	Initial	Main - 24 AV - 4	CCTC	Approved
Single Subject including Internship	Credential	Initial	Main - 224 AV - 158	CCTC	Approved
Early Childhood Education	Master's	ADV	Main - 23	CSUB	N/A
Reading Literacy	Master's/ Credential/ Certificate	ADV	Main 41 COC 14	CCTC and CSUB	Approved
Mild/Moderate Level I and Internship	Credential	Initial	Main - 38 AV - 56	CCTC	Approved
Moderate/ Severe Level I and Internship	Credential	Initial	Main-14 AV- 3	CCTC	Approved
Mild/Moderate Level II/MA	Credential	ADV	Main - 34 AV - 84	CCTC and CSUB	Approved
Moderate/ Severe Level II/MA	Credential	ADV	Main - 30 AV - 13	CCTC and CSUB	Approved
Administrative Services Tier I and Internship	Master's/ Credential	ADV	Main = 91 AV = 53 COC = 12 Hanford =15	CCTC and CSUB	Approved
Administrative Services Tier II	Master's/ Credential	ADV	Main = 35 AV = 14 COC = 14 Hanford = 0	CCTC and CSUB	Approved
Curriculum & Instruction	Master's	ADV	Main 48 AV 28 COC 5 Online 33	CSUB	N/A
Bilingual/Multicultural	Master's	ADV	Main 7	CSUB	N/A
Counseling – Pupil Personnel Services and Student Affairs	Master's/ Credential	ADV	Main - 91	CCTC and CSUB	Approved
School Nurse	Master's/ Credential	Initial	Main - 16	CCTC and CSUB	Approved

*Main is main campus; AV is Antelope Valley Campus; COC is College of the Canyons Campus; and the Hanford location

During academic year 2007-08, tenured and tenure-track faculty positions in the School of Education (SOE) totaled 34. Of these positions, 18 (53%) were tenured and 16 (47%) were tenure-track. Tenured and tenure-track faculty account for 62% of the full-time equivalent faculty in the School of Education. Distribution of faculty by race, gender and rank is summarized in the following table.

SOE Current Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty Ethnicity, Rank, and Gender

Ethnicity	Female Assistant	Female Associate	Female Full	Female Subtotal	Male Assistant	Male Associate	Male Full	Male Subtotal
Hispanic		1	1	2	1	1	1	3
African-American		1		1				0
Native American				0				0
Asian-American		1	1	2	1		2	3
Caucasian	7	4	3	14	2	3	3	8
TOTAL:	7	7	5	19	4	4	6	14
Gender	Female Assistant	Female Associate	Female Full		Male Assistant	Male Associate	Male Full	TOTAL
Male	-	-	-	-	4	4	6	14
Female	7	7	5	19	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	7	7	5	19	4	4	6	14

As noted above, the institution offers off-campus courses at satellite campuses in Antelope Valley, College of the Canyons and Hanford. Representatives from all three were interviewed on the main campus. Faculty and students at the Antelope Valley Campus were interviewed via an interactive video connection.

Changes since Last Visit:

While there have been some fluctuations in enrollment, and the institution is facing some budget declines because of the California budget situation, no major changes were noted. The institution did identify these changes:

- The institution is an early adopter of the California Teacher Performance Expectations and Assessment system required of all later this year.
- The institution, along with all CSU campuses, participated in the CSU System-wide Assessment System of Professional Teacher Preparation Programs that assesses graduates and their supervisors of program through a satisfaction survey.
- Faculty spent two years developing a core set of six Candidate Dispositions, which focus on key professional elements of practice including diversity. This started during the fall 2004 retreat with faculty and community members, while an ad hoc committee of faculty completed the work.
- Advisory Committees have been established for all programs, consisting of faculty, community members, students or recent graduates and some faculty from across campus.
- Student input has been used to make program changes. The Single Subject Program students were concerned about the length of the program. Faculty worked to condense the program by adjusting fieldwork hours and other requirements to assure that students can complete the program in less than one calendar year.
- The Conceptual Framework was developed over a two-year period through a strategic planning process under the direction of faculty committees, which included community members.
- An Assessment Committee was established in 2005 chaired by the then associate dean to develop a unit assessment system utilizing data from the newly adopted LiveText Student Portfolio Program. The Dean of the school assumed the Assessment Committee leadership in 2006 with a co-chair from the Department of Advanced Studies in Education. Previous assessments were incorporated into the new SOE Eight-point Unit Assessment System. A new Director of Technology position was also established to assist with LiveText and assessment implementation.

- Advisory committees recommended the Special Education program add the second language certificate for program candidates. During 2006, this authorization was received by CCTC to insure program completers earned the Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development (CLAD) certification.
- During the past four years, over twenty-five new partnerships have been developed to meet the needs of the community providing opportunities for faculty to engage in the community activities and to improve PreK-12 student learning throughout the region.

One program, the MA in Curriculum and Teaching is offered via distance learning.

C. The visit

This was a concurrent visit with a team from the Commission on Teaching Credentialing using CTC standards for program review. The NCATE and CTC teams met regularly during the visit to exchange information and cross verify findings. The existing state protocol was followed. There were no unusual circumstances affecting this visit.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Mission

The University mission statement is:

California State University, Bakersfield is a comprehensive public university committed to offering excellent undergraduate and graduate programs that advance the intellectual and personal development of its students. An emphasis on student learning is enhanced by a commitment to scholarship, diversity, service, global awareness and life-long learning. The University collaborates with partners in the community to increase the region's overall educational level, enhance its quality of life, and support its economic development.

The SOE Mission is:

In support of the university's vision of excellence the mission of the School of Education is to be a professional learning institution that prepares highly capable professionals to serve our culturally and linguistically diverse community with integrity.

Meetings with the President, Provost and Dean confirmed that the SOE mission statement is consistent with the university mission statement, and is seen as an important constituent of the overall mission. Specifically, the President reported that given the major goals of the University, increasing the region's overall educational level, enhancing its quality of life, and supporting its economic development, the role of the SOC is central and affects all three goals.

The Conceptual Framework

The unit's conceptual framework is concise and clear. In its essence, the framework includes a focus on the concepts of excellence, integrity, and caring. Each of these concepts are further expanded and given meaning as follows:

Excellence—Characterized by:

- desire to excel on the part of individuals and learning organizations;
- mastery or quality of performance;
- going beyond the ordinary, the competent.

Integrity—Characterized by an individual who demonstrates the following steps:

- discerning what is right and wrong;
- acting in support of the right, even at personal cost;
- saying openly that they are acting on their convictions.

Caring—Characterized by benefiting students, families, colleagues, and the community. Caring is demonstrated by many behaviors including:

- acting on the basis of moral reasoning or social justice;
- showing compassion and/or empathy;

- reaching out to others and making connections.

A clearly delineated statement of candidate dispositions further develops the conceptual framework. These dispositions, which span all programs, as does the conceptual framework, are:

Professional Collaboration

Candidates will participate in action-oriented collaboration that will enable them to learn from others and provide leadership in partnerships with all stakeholders.

Reflective Practitioner

Candidates are reflective, life long learners who apply problem solving and critical thinking strategies and the respectful appreciation of differing points of view.

Ethical Professional

Candidates' actions are based on accepted professional standards of conduct and reflect insight and awareness with respect to diverse perspectives, opinions, obligations, and ethical responsibilities of the profession.

Student/Client Centered

Candidates, throughout their programs, will prioritize the needs of the students/clients they serve by maintaining trusting relationships built upon caring, nurturing (respective), and meaningful interactions.

Professional Leader

Candidates, throughout their programs, will be strong, determined, professional leaders with a clear instructional focus using effective communication skills and a willingness to take risks to ensure the advancement, safety, and welfare of all students in our communities.

Professional Competence

Candidates will maintain high programmatic outcomes that reflect research-based practices, principles of learning differentiation, and standards-based instruction.

In addition to the work of Nel Noddings, an extensive bibliography outlining the sources used in developing the conceptual framework and dispositions is provided. The dispositions are assessed regularly by faculty review of students in which students are rated as having

Development of the Conceptual Framework

In the process of reconsidering the conceptual framework, a Strategic Planning Task Force, with representatives from each department and a faculty member as chair, began the process of assessing the status of the School of Education (SOE) and a shared vision for improvement.

The Strategic Planning Task Force employed an eDelphi strategic planning process that reached out to faculty, staff, students, and community to develop consensus. The process included two surveys with the results demonstrating the internal sense of vision held by faculty and staff.

The Teacher Education Advisory Committee, chaired by the Provost has representatives from across the campus and throughout the PreK-14 community in addition to program level advisory groups. It is evident from minutes that this body played a critical role in the development of the

Conceptual Framework by providing input to drafts and helping in the dissemination of the document.

Faculty and students in the programs of the unit and K-12 partners understand the conceptual framework. It is embedded in course syllabi and the content selected by instructors. There is little understanding by arts and science faculty largely because programs at CSU Bakersfield admit students as post baccalaureate students who already have completed their arts and science degrees.

Assessment of understanding of the conceptual framework/dispositions occurs at several points in the program. Students self-assess disposition at program entry, middle, and end of the program. Advisors assess student dispositions at the middle and end of the program.

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Level: (Initial and Advanced)

The School of Education at California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) offers five initial level credential programs, seven programs leading to advanced credentials, and three advanced programs that lead to non-credential related master's degrees. All programs through which candidates earn credentials were fully approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing at the time of this visit. None of the unit's programs are accredited by other agencies. However, the School Nurse Program is offered through the Department of Nursing that is accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing. The unit has developed a School of Education Eight-point Unit Assessment System. Data collected across the eight components of the unit assessment system are used to measure candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions for initial and advanced programs.

A. Content knowledge for teacher candidates

Initial Level

The California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) is used to assess content knowledge of initial level teacher candidates for Multiple (elementary) and Single (secondary) Subject credentials, as well as Level 1 Education Specialist credential candidates. The CSUB pass rate for program completers is almost 100% as is the statewide pass rate for 2006 - 2007.

Conditions for obtaining California subject matter competence should be noted. (1) All candidates for the Multiple Subject credential must pass the CSET. (2) Single Subject and Education Specialist candidates can meet subject matter competence requirements by passing the CSET in the subject they will teach or by completing a state approved subject matter preparation program. (3) The California State University system requires candidates to be fully subject matter competent prior to admission to a credential program but makes these exceptions: (a) CSU campuses can admit some candidates who are not fully subject matter competent. That number can be 15% of the total number of candidates admitted the previous year. (b) Candidates participating in a blended program (a program that offers components of an undergraduate degree program and credential program simultaneously) can be admitted to the credential program prior to full subject matter competence. (c) All candidates admitted to final student teaching must be fully subject matter competent.

Content knowledge is also verified through a CSU system required minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.67 at admission. Candidates must also maintain a 3.0 or better GPA while in a teacher preparation program. Average program GPA for initial teacher candidates was 3.68 for fall 2005 through spring 2007. The unit also requires applicants to pass the reading and writing sections of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) prior to admission. Candidates must pass the math section prior to final student teaching. Program completers have a 100% pass rate on the CBEST. Additionally, all Multiple Subject credential candidates must pass the Reading Instructional Competence Assessment (RICA), a state requirement, prior to being

credentialed. The unit's overall pass rate for Multiple Subject candidates on the RICA from 2004 through 2006 was 97%. The statewide pass rate during those years was 98%.

The unit also monitors content knowledge of initial teacher candidates through signature assignments. These are assignments within each program that are aligned with the conceptual framework, candidate standards such as the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), and program goals. California Teaching Performance Expectations are 13 standards for teacher candidates related to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and similar to INTASC standards.

Interviews with candidates and other program participants confirmed that the level of candidate content knowledge for teaching is good. Master teachers and administrators speak highly of the content preparation of candidates.

The CSU System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs surveys initial program graduates and employers (supervisors) about graduates' preparation. Data reported are from surveys administered near the end of the first year of teaching. Seventy-six percent of program completers and 88 percent of employers report that CSUB teacher candidates from 2001 – 2007 were either well or adequately prepared in content knowledge. System-wide average results show that 79 percent for program completers and 90 percent for employers report adequate or better content preparation.

Advanced Level

The unit offers six advanced programs for teachers. These include Early Childhood Education, Reading Literacy, Level II Special Education (Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe), Curriculum and Instruction, and Bilingual/Multicultural. A master's degree can be earned with each, and for Reading Literacy and Special Education, advanced credentials can be obtained.

State licensure tests for content knowledge are not available at the advanced level. Candidates for advanced teaching credentials must hold basic (initial) teaching credentials through which content knowledge was verified. All CSUB post-baccalaureate students meet the University Graduate Writing Proficiency requirement through either course content for an undergraduate degree, a writing exam, or a score of 41 or better on the writing portion of the CBEST. CBEST scores are tracked using the campus student information management system.

In addition, advanced programs for teachers use program-culminating activities as an indicator of candidate content knowledge. Candidates choose a thesis, project, or culminating (comprehensive) examination as a master's degree culminating activity. In 2006 through fall 2007, 13 candidates (100%) successfully completed Early Childhood and Family Education Program culminating activities. In fall 2007 there were 17 graduates of the Curriculum and Instruction Program and four graduates of the Early Childhood Education Program.

The unit also monitors content knowledge of advanced teacher candidates through signature assignments and grade point averages. Aggregated data indicates that 100% of candidates in advanced programs for teachers were at target or acceptable levels for fall 2006 through fall 2007, with 98.9% at the target level. Examples of signature assignments include the language assessment report and ELD and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) lesson plans for the Bilingual / Multicultural Program, the portfolio for Special Education and Reading / Literacy candidates, the Time Line Project in the Early Childhood Program, and the Rand Project on research solutions for the Curriculum and Instruction Program. During this same

period aggregated GPAs of candidates in these programs, another indicator of content knowledge in use by the unit, were 3.52 at the beginning transition point, 3.68 at the middle point, and 3.63 at the end transition point.

B. Content knowledge of other school personnel

Programs for other school personnel offered by the unit include the Administrative Services Credential Program at both the preliminary (Tier I) and professional (Tier II) levels, the Counseling Program for the Pupil Personnel Services credential and the School Nurse Program.

Candidates meet the University Graduate Writing Proficiency requirement as described above. Counseling candidates take the national Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination at program completion. In fall and winter 2007, 28 candidates took the exam and passed for a 100% pass rate. One hundred percent (18 candidates from 2005 – 2008) of School Nursing candidates passed the National Council Licensure Examination for the RN license.

Signature assignments and grade point averages are also used to monitor content knowledge of other school personnel. Educational administration candidates complete signature assignments in the foundations of education course, the curriculum development course (pass rates in the last year were 95 percent and 100 percent respectively), as well as the culminating examination. The spring through fall 2007 pass rate for the culminating examination was about 75 percent with 63 candidates taking the exam. The exam can be repeated. For the period from fall 2006 through fall 2007 aggregated GPAs of candidates in Educational Administration and Counseling programs were 3.59 at the beginning transition point, 3.64 at the middle point, and 3.74 at the end transition point.

C. Pedagogical content knowledge for teachers

Initial Level

Pedagogical content knowledge for teacher candidates is related to California Teaching Performance Expectations, TPE 1 (*Making Subject Matter Comprehensible*), TPE 4 (*Making Content Accessible*), and TPE 9 (*Instructional Planning*). Candidates develop pedagogical content skills through methods courses that, for example, include differentiated instructional strategies for cultural backgrounds, prior experiences, knowledge of P-12 learners, and integration of technology. Examination of course plans shows the unit offers initial programs through a logical sequence of courses, including methods courses.

During Stage 2 (second quarter) candidates are assigned to classrooms for half days for eight weeks. They are mentored by master teachers and supervised by a university supervisor. In Stage 3 (third quarter) candidates are in student teaching placements full time for 10 weeks. A university supervisor supervises them. Many candidates complete part of the program as intern teachers. In California intern teachers are employed as teachers of record while earning a Preliminary Teaching credential. Interns meet state subject matter competence requirements and other requirements for the issuance of a California Intern credential. Interns are mentored by a site-based support provider and supervised by a university supervisor. Evidence for this element is developed as candidates create and teach lesson and unit plans in which they apply pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Signature assignments for the Multiple Subject Program include a literary ability case study, a reflection paper on ESL/ELD practices, as well as field experience evaluations. Single subject candidates complete lesson and unit plan signature assignments in their subject areas, as well as a TPE based portfolio. Special Education candidates' signature assignments include identifying

characteristics of students, assessment of students, selection of instructional strategies, and evaluations of field experiences. For 2006 – 2007 the unit reported aggregated data that shows that about 98 percent of candidates were at target or acceptable levels for planning proficiency. One hundred percent of candidates passed field experience evaluations.

Candidates complete the California Technology Assistance Program (CTAP) Level 1 (for teachers) as a prerequisite to admission to initial credential programs. Syllabi and interviews with candidates and faculty indicated that technology is also integrated in program courses and signature assignments. Candidates create an electronic portfolio in LiveText. Data for 2006 - 2007 shows that, at the beginning transition point, about 90 percent of Multiple Subject candidates and 83 percent of Single Subject candidates were at acceptable or target levels on technology proficiency. Candidates are allowed to repeat CTAP workshops and courses in order to pass.

Interviews confirm that CSUB candidates are adequately prepared to use technology for instructional purposes. Instructors model the use of technology in many courses and provide opportunities for candidates to apply technology to assignments. Conversation with candidates and master teachers indicates that schools vary in the technology resources available for instruction.

In interviews candidates cited many examples that demonstrated strong pedagogical content knowledge. Master teachers and area administrators speak highly of the quality and abilities of candidates from CSUB. CSU System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs data from initial program completers and employers (direct supervisors) shows that on selected questions related to pedagogical content knowledge, 77 percent of program completers and 81 percent of employers report that CSUB teacher candidates were either well or adequately prepared. Program completer data is from 2000 – 2006; employer data is from 2004 – 2005. These results fall at the approximate midpoint of the range of results for all CSU campuses.

Advanced Level

Information for element C for advanced programs for teachers was included in the IR response to element E, *Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel*. Candidates in the Curriculum and Instruction program are assessed on pedagogical content knowledge for teachers through a curriculum development / backward mapping collaborative project in which candidates analyze information for four sub-groups and trace information on one K-12 content standard over a three-year period. Data indicate that about 95 percent of Curriculum and Instruction candidates performed at the target or acceptable level in 2007.

In the Reading / Literacy Program candidates complete signature assignments in which they write a reading intervention report, and collect and analyze pretest and posttest data and create lesson plans in clinical experience. For 2007, 100 percent of candidates performed at target or acceptable levels. Special education candidates in the Level II program are assessed through student teaching evaluations. Candidates in the Bilingual / Multicultural Program complete signature assignments that include a thematic unit, individualized reading inventory or year-long multicultural reading plan, and they design a curriculum unit plan to demonstrate proficiency related to this element. The unit did not provide performance data for these programs. Candidates and graduates across these programs praised the usefulness instruction and learning in this element which makes them more confident professionals.

D. Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers

Initial Level

Specific Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) related to this element include TPE 5 (*Student Engagement*), TPE 6 (*Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices*), TPE 7 (*Teaching English Learners*), TPE 8 (*Learning About Students*), TPE 10 (*Instructional Time*), TPE 11 (*Social Environment*), TPE 12 (*Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations*), and TPE 13 (*Professional Growth*). Candidates develop professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in program courses and field experiences through which they develop lesson and unit plans, apply instructional strategies in classrooms, and reflect on the results of these teaching experiences.

Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates complete a series of signature assignments, observations, case studies, reflections, lesson plans, student teaching and field experiences that are compiled into a TPE based portfolio to assess this element. Student teaching evaluations are also part of the assessment. Special education candidates are assessed through class observations, three-way conferences and student teacher evaluations. For 2006 – 2007 the unit reported that more than 99 percent of candidates performed at target or acceptable levels on assessments for this element.

CSU System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation data from initial program completers shows that on selected questions related to professional and pedagogical skills for teachers, 81 percent of CSUB program completers report that they were either well or adequately prepared. Data is from 2000 – 2006. These results fall at the approximate midpoint of the range of all CSU campuses.

Advanced Level

Information for element D for advanced programs for teachers was included in the IR response to element E, *Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel*. Curriculum and Instruction candidates analyze a single school plan for student achievement that focuses on professional development for school improvement, and they evaluate current research to inform practice. Reading / Literacy candidates conduct action research and develop implementation plans. These candidates demonstrate ability to use research and technology by participating in online and hybrid (partially online) courses. The unit aggregated assessment data related to this element and element E for all advanced programs showing that at the mid-program transition point of the unit assessment system Component 3 data showed that more than 99 percent of candidates performed at target and acceptable levels in 2007. For Component 4, 90 percent were at target or acceptable levels.

Professional and pedagogical knowledge development begins early in programs at the initial and advanced levels through foundations and early field experience courses. In these courses candidates become aware of the political, historical, social and philosophical foundations of education. Candidates are taught about being reflective practitioners and they are given many opportunities to practice self-reflection for their own professional growth. Candidates and master teachers provided ample and impressive examples of reflection and its impact on candidate progress.

E. Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel Advanced Level

Educational administration candidates for both the credential and the master's degree complete a comprehensive exam based on the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. Candidates also prepare a portfolio based on these standards and complete a follow-up oral

examination. Counseling candidates complete a national comprehensive exam and 600 hours of supervised internship. School Nursing candidates are evaluated through their preceptor supervised school practicum evaluations.

The unit aggregated assessment data related to this element and element D for all advanced programs showing that at the mid-program transition point of the unit assessment system Component 3 data showed that more than 99 percent of candidates performed at target and acceptable levels in 2007. For Component 4, 90 percent were at target or acceptable levels. Additionally, the unit reported that the technology proficiency of candidates aggregated for all advanced programs at the beginning and mid-program transition points for 2006 – 2007, showed that about 97 percent of candidates were at target level and 3 percent were at unacceptable.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, and faculty confirmed and strengthened perceptions of these advanced programs as being highly effective and extremely collaborative programs for extending the learning of school professionals. Many interviewees talked about the community and family feelings they have about their participation in programs offered by the unit.

F. Dispositions for All Candidates

As part of the conceptual framework, the following six dispositions are identified for all candidates in initial and advanced programs as necessary to help all students learn:

- Professional Collaboration
- Reflective Practitioner
- Ethical Professional
- Student/Client Centered
- Professional Leader
- Professional Competence

Dispositions were developed through a series of faculty retreats and meetings of faculty and community members over the past few years. Dispositions are communicated with candidates through numerous materials including program brochures and many course syllabi. Candidates, faculty, and community partners across most programs reported that they were aware of, and discussed the unit's dispositions. In interviews, candidates and faculty provided examples of activities to help candidates learn about the dispositions. Faculty and program coordinators confirmed that for most programs dispositions of individual candidate are discussed and identification of unacceptable dispositions can result in remediation or dismissal.

Initial Level

Multiple Subject candidates are introduced to the dispositions during program orientation. Prior to admission they write an essay based on a prompt designed to address dispositions. Master teachers and university supervisors on midterm and final field evaluation reports evaluate dispositions through the program. Single subject candidates learn of dispositions through course syllabi. They are evaluated as a part of Stage 2 and 3 field courses on midterm and final evaluations. Interviews indicated that candidates and faculty in the Single Subject program did not show the level of awareness of disposition shown by participants in other programs. Special Education candidates also learn about dispositions through courses. Evaluation is accomplished through a self-evaluation form and through field experience courses. The unit reported results on questions related to dispositions from the CSU System-wide Survey. From 2003 – 2005, 81 percent of program completers reported that they were well or adequately prepared in response to these questions. The CSU system average was about 82 percent.

Advanced Level for Teachers

Bilingual / Multicultural Program candidates are introduced to dispositions through course syllabi. Class discussions reinforce ideas about dispositions. Reading / Literacy Program and Early Childhood Education candidates are assessed on dispositions through self-reflection in relation to their own teaching, as well as by peers, course and/or clinical instructors and for Reading / Literacy candidates, by school administrators. Faculty review candidates in the Curriculum and Instruction program quarterly. Candidates write a reflection on their dispositions at the end of the program.

Advanced Level for Other School Personnel

Candidates in the Educational Administration Program and School Nursing Program are introduced to dispositions through course syllabi. Ideas about dispositions are reinforced in class discussions. For school nurses' dispositions are closely related to national standards for care and professional performance. Evaluation is conducted through field experiences.

Data on disposition ratings is displayed on a variety of forms specific to each program. For 2007 data indicated that all candidates overall dispositions were rated at target or acceptable levels.

G. Student learning for teacher candidates

Basic credential candidates assess students learning and use results to modify instruction to develop successful learning experiences for all students. California Teaching Performance Expectations guide preparation and assessment of candidates for this element. Related TPEs are TPE 2 (*Monitors Student Learning During Instruction*) and TPE 3 (*Interpretation and Use of Assessments*).

Multiple Subject candidates are assessed at mid-program through the case study report in EDEL 430 Literacy Acquisition-B course, as well as through teaching late in the program in advanced field experience in which they use pretest and posttest data to document impact on student learning.

Candidates in the Single Subject Program are assessed on this element at the end of the program through supervisor evaluations of student teaching as well as through the final candidate portfolio in which they report on their development of meaningful learning experiences.

A mid-program case study in EDSP 505 Classroom Management and Positive Behavior Support and a final case study in the Assessment of Students course are used to assess development and impact of Special Education candidates on student learning.

Aggregated data show that about 94 percent of candidates in these programs were performing at target or acceptable levels in mid-program and program end assessments. CSU System-wide surveys indicate a high level of candidate preparation. In surveys of program graduates from 2003 – 2005 about 82 percent of CSUB initial credential candidates reported that they were well or adequately prepared on questions related to this element. The system-wide average for the time period was also about 82 percent. CSU System-wide surveys given at program exit from 2005 – 2007 show that about 89 percent of candidates report that they were well or adequately prepared in this element.

Candidates were able to cite many examples of differentiating instruction to meet the individual cultural, language, and learning needs for the diverse populations of students in area schools.

They, and master teachers, reported attending IEP meetings and working with special education teachers. Examples of activities are documented in candidate portfolios we reviewed during the visit.

Advanced Level

Candidates in the Bilingual / Multicultural master's degree program are interviewed at mid-program and program end using a survey instrument that determines their perceptions of their instructional effectiveness. The interview pulls in pre- and post- student data on attitudes, skills, language improvement, and cultural and affective changes.

The Curriculum and Instruction master's degree program uses signature assignments to assess this element. One is the curriculum development / backwards mapping project described in element C, above. Data from spring to winter 2007 show about 95 percent of candidates to be at target or acceptable levels on the curriculum development project. Candidates also complete projects to infuse standards-based technology in the curriculum. In the culminating activity candidates show best practices in curriculum and technology integration through action research projects.

The Early Childhood Education program has candidates complete a pre- and post-assessment and reflection in which they report on their impact on the development of learning among the students, families and communities with whom they work.

Reading / Literacy candidates assess their impact on P-12 student learning by implementing a Literacy Clinic Report. They also reflect on their teaching, tutoring in clinic and mentoring of peers. Information is maintained in candidate portfolios.

Candidates in advanced programs praised the quality of programs and faculty and provided examples to confirm the value and applicability of knowledge, skills and dispositions they are developing in programs to their roles in schools.

H. Student learning for other school personnel

Candidates in programs for other school personnel are prepared to use assessment to establish and modify environments, instruction and processes that support student learning in their areas of responsibility. Signature assignments related to this element are scored as part of Component 5 of the unit assessment system.

Candidates in the Counseling Program collect and analyze data on student learning and apply strategies for improving student learning in their instructional settings. In self-evaluations of counseling fieldwork they reflect on the effectiveness of modifications.

Educational administration candidates write a vision statement for the ideal school as part of their portfolios. These are scored using a rubric. Candidates also survey the cultural values and perceptions of two different cultural groups at their instructional sites. They use this information to establish and evaluate environments for student learning. Additionally, in the Personnel Management course they work with a classroom teacher and student data to design and report on ways to improve student learning.

Candidates for the School Nursing credential in field experiences collect and analyze data related to student health needs and apply strategies for improving learning while balancing the health needs of children.

The unit aggregated data for all advanced programs for both teachers and other school personnel. That aggregated data indicated that more than 99 percent of candidates were performing at target or acceptable levels on respective assessments related to impact on student learning at mid-program.

In interviews, candidates and graduates of programs for other school professionals commented on the quality and value of these programs in furthering their professional goals and in making them more effective educators.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Candidates participating in California State University, Bakersfield School of Education are being well prepared as educators across the elements of Standard 1. Candidate dispositions are specifically delineated and frequently assessed for most programs. The unit offers programs that have carefully planned sequences of courses and experiences to ensure that all candidates have sufficient professional, pedagogical and pedagogical content knowledge and skills to have a positive impact on learning for the students with whom they will come in contact.

Recommendation:

Initial Level – MET

Advanced Level -- MET

Areas for Improvement:

New Assessment data for the elements of Standard 1 were not fully analyzed or clearly displayed.

Rationale: The unit has an assessment system through which data on candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions has been collected. However, the data is displayed in a variety of formats and in different stages of aggregation and analysis that makes it difficult to interpret results.

New Participants in the Single Subject Program were less familiar with candidate dispositions.

Rationale: The unit has used a variety of techniques to communicate candidate dispositions to all program participants. Some candidates and faculty of the Single Subject Program were unable to effectively discuss the disposition and express how dispositions are connected to learning to teach in the program.

State Team Decision: Standard is Met

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

A. Assessment System

The CSUB Teacher Education Assessment System was developed by a variety of stakeholders including School of Education (SOE) faculty and representatives from the Kern County Superintendent's office and from the Professional Development School. A variety of committees worked on the development and implementation of the assessment plan. These included the Teacher Education Advisory Committee, the Accreditation Leadership Committee, the School Academic Council and Unit Assessment Committee. The Unit Assessment Committee meets regularly and their main focus has been the assessment system. They have discussed the relationship to the Conceptual Framework, dispositions, program assessment, and the California State University (CSU) system wide survey. The Assessment Committee along with SOE administrators and faculty help to ensure there is a comprehensive and integrated assessment system. The assessment system follows the mission and theme of the university and School of Education as it links to dispositions and standards from state and national organizations.

A pilot assessment system was developed in the 2005-06 academic year. This included a common rubric and use of the LiveText system for signature assessments. After reviewing the pilot system, a revised assessment system was developed in the fall of 2006 with ongoing review by Program Coordinators and the Assessment Committee.

The SOE has developed a two-prong avenue of assessment--both candidate and unit assessment through the Eight Point Assessment System. The eight points include: State Licensure Exam for Content, Content Assessment of Knowledge Base, Assessment of Planning, Student Teaching and Internship, Impact on Student Learning, Unit Operation, Candidate Dispositions, and Technology Proficiency. For candidate assessment, faculty report that a program group of faculty choose key assessments. These assessments are based on course content and standards. With that information, thorough observation of candidates in field experiences, and interviewing candidates and employers, faculty are confident they have chosen the right key assessments.

Part of this assessment system is the development of program assessment plans. Program assessment data is found primarily in program binders. Data include the referencing of all eight components of the assessment system, the program assessment system chart, the signature assessment chart, and the proficiency alignment chart. These plans also show when in the program the assessments are administered. The proficiency alignment chart provides a connection between program, NCATE, state, and professional standards. There is alignment with standards of professional organizations including CEC, NAEYC and IRA. Programs not using national standards for alignment are aligned with state standards.

The program assessment charts provide information regarding the three transition points and the key assignments for candidates. These key assignments match the eight components of the assessment system.

Although there are similar sections of the assessment system in the program binders for every program, the content and style of rubrics and data collected does vary. Programs have provided evidence that candidates have met criteria in the Eight Point Assessment System for program criteria. Most programs are using LiveText to record candidate progress on individual assignments but this is not found throughout all programs, particularly at the advanced level. The program assessment plans at the advanced level are less delineated than those at the initial level. The advanced programs do use the Eight Point Assessment Plan but use of the disposition form and process vary in practice.

For unit assessment the unit uses the CSU System Wide Survey, the Unit Operations Survey, course evaluations completed by candidates, reappointment, promotion, and tenure documents, internal university review, appeal processes for faculty and candidates and the CSUB School of Business Marketing Study.

The CSU System Wide Survey and the Unit Operation Survey have been developed to obtain information from candidates. The CSU System Wide Survey is sent to first year teachers and employers in the CSU system on a yearly basis. The survey questions both graduates and employers about how well teachers are prepared in areas such as teaching strategies, use of technology and other materials, dispositions, collaborative skills and student outcomes. The Unit Operation Survey is distributed quarterly and asks 12 questions that deal with general issues in the unit including advisement, scheduling, technology, faculty qualifications, diversity and how information is disseminated. Faculty and administrators use this information to review program issues and make changes as needed. When received from the dean's office the department chairs discuss outcomes with faculty and make program changes as needed.

The unit provides a Student Opinionnaire of Courses and Instruction (SOCI) for candidates to complete at the end of each course they have taken. The evaluation focuses primarily on "non content" portions of a course including grading, return of assignments, and other characteristics of faculty members. The data from this survey is analyzed by the department chair, dean, university personnel committee, Provost and President.

Various components of the assessment system are referred to in the Conceptual Framework. There is mention of different areas of unit assessment, candidate disposition and alignment of candidate proficiencies to standards. The chart "School of Education Candidate Proficiencies" found in the Conceptual Framework did provide some information about the unit assessment system.

Also linked to the Conceptual Framework is the assessment of candidate dispositions on a unit wide basis. A rubric has been developed and it is used at different times in a candidate's program. In most programs the disposition checklist is introduced at the beginning of the program and is reviewed at mid-point and at the end of a candidate's program. Candidates who have difficulties with the dispositions discuss the issues with faculty and department chairs. A "Notice of Need to Improve" form is completed and faculty and candidates work together on this plan. The student teaching evaluation form does not directly link to the disposition list. There are general references to professional competencies on the student teaching evaluation but not the specific unit dispositions. Information about the dispositions is found on the course syllabi with reference to procedures of what a candidate can do if they disagree with the disposition decision by faculty.

Multiple and single subject and special education programs have student handbooks that describe program admission, continuation and completion requirements. Programs at the advanced level have different admission requirements than initial programs and information can be found on websites.

Faculty and administrators report that they understand the assessment system, have input into it and review it. The assessment system is a relatively new part of the School of Education but faculty and administrators both report that they plan on continuing the data collection and analysis. Program coordinators and department chairs ensure that program assessments are in place. These program assessments are a large part of the unit assessment system. Faculty and administrator interviews demonstrate they can articulate the assessment system and use it for program improvement.

In order to ensure that assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias the unit uses qualitative and quantitative measures and are evaluated at different points of a candidates' program. Both internal and external sources of data are used and the multi-source Eight Point System provides a variety of data. Candidates are made aware of assessment requirements through advisement and courses.

B. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation

Data from licensure tests and Grade Point Average (GPA) are routinely updated in the Banner system of data collection. The unit will be moving to PeopleSoft software within the next few months and faculty and staff are going through training at this time. The GPA is recorded quarterly as well as data collected on statewide competency tests including California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) and Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). Advanced programs that do not have licensure tests use a variety of assessments that are part of their program assessment system.

Previously mentioned committees discuss assessment results but there is no clear person or group in charge of collecting, maintaining, and summarizing much of the candidate and program data. One of the department chairs collects data on the Unit Operations Survey, aggregates and distributes to the dean and department chairs. Much of the remaining data collection and aggregation for candidate assessment is completed by the dean.

C. Use of data for program improvement

The Unit Assessment Committee has expanded its membership to more fully utilize faculty expertise in the assessment process. Input from the Unit Operation Survey is used to improve program operations. Due to expanded and improved technology faculty review course content and candidate feedback on a more regular basis through program meetings, program coordinator meetings and through the Assessment Council. For each key assessment faculty have developed a continuous improvement plan that describes how the faculty will use the data from the assessment to improve course and program outcomes.

Most off campus courses are taught by faculty on the Bakersfield campus. For those faculty who teach in off campus sites only, the Bakersfield campus faculty meet with them to ensure they understand the assessment system.

Data driven changes in unit programs include changes in the Educational Administration Program adding assessments in the two fieldwork courses, educational technology usage by faculty, improved diversity knowledge and the use of LiveText for data collection. Each

program provides a variety of ways they are using the signature assessments to plan for continuous improvement through a variety of strategies.

Candidates learn about the assessment plan and assessment data through coursework and membership on committees such as the Teacher Education Advisory Council.

Candidate complaint records are kept in student files in the Credential Office and a detailed description of the policy and procedures for this are available in the Catalog.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has an assessment system that includes both candidate and unit operations. Key assessments are used to determine and monitor candidate performance. Data is collected and analyzed by the unit. Much of the maintenance of the unit's assessment system is the responsibility of the dean. Faculty are using data to make changes in courses and programs.

Recommendation:

Initial: Met

Advanced: Met

Areas for Improvement:

The unit is dependent on the dean's office to aggregate, analyze and report candidate and program data limiting the scope and organization of data produced and used.

Rationale:

There are no personnel whose primary responsibility is to oversee collection and analysis of data. The responsibility falls primarily to the dean. As one more task in the dean's office the process does not get the full attention needed.

D. State Team Decision: Standard is Met

STANDARD 3. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Level: (Initial and/or Advanced)

A. Collaboration between unit and school partners

Field experiences and clinical practices are designed based on input and collaboration from a range of stakeholders through the Program Advisory Committee meetings, including faculty, candidates, administrators, Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Induction Program Directors, community partners and subject matter faculty from other schools within the university setting.

Feedback from graduates and employers through the Graduate Follow-up Survey is compiled and reported at Program Advisory Meetings and results impact the design of field experiences. Many stakeholders report that faculty and leadership of the unit are responsive to community needs and requests.

Monthly program meetings are conducted with faculty and Multiple Subject university supervisors providing updates and input on field placements. Master teachers and school site administrators report that they have easy access to university supervisors, program advisors and program directors by email or phone to verify credential information, requirements, placements, and for other situations in which they need support.

Formal agreements exist between the Trustees of the California State University California State University, Bakersfield and 57 local school districts within the service area of the university. These agreements describe the districts' willingness to provide practice teaching situations for the candidates who are enrolled in teacher training curricula of the unit. The districts and/or unit leaders select the classroom supervisors who will provide feedback to the candidate during the field experiences. Candidates in the intern programs receive on site support from an experienced teacher on staff and/or the site administrator. Master teachers, field supervisors, and school site administrators have access to unit field placement coordinators, program advisors and program directors and coordinators by email or phone to clarify information about field experiences. Many school/district sites have been accepting student teachers and interns for several years and have established long-term working partnerships with specific program leaders.

The unit faculty designs, delivers and evaluates all field experiences and clinical practice in which candidates are required to participate. Input and suggestions are sought from the K-12 community and university supervisors. Interviews with these groups indicate that programmatic changes are made based on suggestions. Informal conversations between university supervisors, site based supervisors and site administrators serve as another source of feedback to the unit.

Input from the candidate is considered in field experience placements. Candidates inform the unit of preferences based on location, grade level and in the case of the Single Subject Credential Program, specific teachers with whom they are familiar from earlier field experiences.

Many advanced candidates are involved in field experiences at their own employment site. Each candidate is assigned a school-based supervisor and a program faculty supervisor who provide feedback and guidance as the advanced candidate progresses through the required experiences of the field placement.

Coursework and field experiences occur in other sites in addition to the main campus in Bakersfield. A large number of candidates from the Multiple Subjects, Single Subject, Intern, Education Specialist, and Educational Administration Programs are placed throughout the Antelope Valley area and are served by faculty at this site. A smaller group of candidates in Multiple Subjects, Intern, Reading Specialist and Educational Administration Level I Programs receive instruction and field experiences in the College of the Canyons. A small group of Educational Administration candidates form a cohort group in Hanford, satisfying a need in that community. Programs are delivered consistently across sites.

A partnership exists between the School of Education and the Greenfield Union School District which establishes a Professional Development School. The school district provides classroom space for courses and provides multiple fieldwork locations for early classroom experiences as well as student teaching, master teachers, and access to a state of the art technology center. The School of Education is an active partner in the Kern County Superintendent of Schools Intern Consortium, with over forty school districts participating, as well as participating with the Intern Program based in the Bakersfield High School District.

In addition to the Program Advisory Committee meetings, the unit faculty and administration collaborate with school partners in many different settings in the K-12 community. Several faculty members and the dean serve on school district advisory boards throughout the university service region, including the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Induction Program collaborative, Preschool Literacy Project, School Counselor organization, Kern County Curriculum and Instruction Committees and others.

The documentation and evaluation of the candidate performance during the field experiences as well as the results of signature assignments and other field-based assignments are analyzed and reported to stakeholder groups at both the initial and advanced levels, providing feedback for program improvement in the areas of fieldwork and clinical practice.

B. Design, implementation and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice

Field experiences provide opportunities for candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state and professional standards. The unit designs and implements multiple field experience components into its respective programs. Most programs have a minimum of two field experiences that follow the program's course sequence, though the prescribed sequence of some programs is adjustable to meet individual candidate needs. The following chart lists the field experiences and clinical practice for each program and the number of hours required.

Program	Field Experiences (Observation and/or Practicum)	Clinical Practices (Student Teaching or Internship)
Multiple Subject Program	Early Field Experience associated with course work: 60 hours Field Experience: 36 hours	Half-day Student Teaching 15 hours a week for 10 weeks: 150 hours Full-day Student Teaching 30 hours a week for 10 weeks: 300 hours
Single Subject Program	Early Field Experience associated with course work: 50 hours Early Field Experience: 30 hours	Full-time Student Teaching 30 hours a week for 10 weeks: 300 hours
Special Education Program	Early Field Experience: 45 hours pre-requisite for program admission	Full-time Student Teaching in General Education setting for 100 hours and in Special Education class for 300 hours or Internship Seminars for two years
Bilingual /Multicultural	EDBI 476 candidates complete an informal survey and language assessment of students. EDBI 506 candidates complete a Teacher Expectations, Student Achievement Log EDBI 504 candidates complete a reading assessment	
Counseling	600 hours Field Experience	No Student Teaching
Early Childhood Education	EDEC 444 – Internship course where students shadow an administrator, and other course embedded activities	EDEC Early Childhood Internship
Educational Admin Credential	Field Experience 2 quarters 110 hours each: 220 hours	No Student Teaching
Nursing	Practicum Courses 2 quarters: one elementary school practicum and one junior/senior high school practicum 75 hours each: 150 hours	No Student Teaching
Reading Specialist Credential	Field-Based Literacy Intervention: 12 hours Field-Based Literacy Research: 40 hours Professional Development in-service: 2 hours	Clinical Experience: 20 hours Advanced Clinical Experience: 20 hours

Initial teacher preparation program candidates are required to complete an early field experience that provides the opportunity to observe experienced teachers at elementary, middle school and/or high school sites. Field experiences are designed so candidates gradually assume responsibilities in the classroom leading to full teaching responsibilities for the class.

Candidates receive feedback from the master teacher and the university supervisor regularly. Candidates attend seminars with the university supervisors to discuss areas of concern and provide strategies and tools to implement during the student teaching experience.

Interns complete the required 120 hours of pre-service staff development, are employed as the teacher of record at a school site and are required to attend seminars while teaching. University supervisors visit candidates to evaluate their performance and provide feedback. Intern candidates also have a school-site coach who provides on-site support.

Candidates in most of the advanced programs in the School of Education are required to successfully complete a field experience or clinical practice component. Site and university supervisors provide feedback to the candidate and evaluate performance through observations and examination of completed signature assignments.

The Reading/Literacy course instructors supervise candidates as they participate in reading interventions clinics organized by the department and implemented at a site in the K-12 community. This spring, the clinic will involve at risk adolescents from foster home placements who are reading significantly below grade level. The two field experiences occur in different grade levels so that by the end of the program, the candidates have experiences with elementary and secondary students.

The School Nurse program ensures that each candidate has a skilled and knowledgeable preceptor with a current California RN license, a current Health Services Credential and an MSN or high degree, to supervise the clinical experience. The clinical experience must be at least two years of full-time employment, and a minimum of one year in school nursing.

All candidates in the Education Administration Program receive feedback and support from an on site, fully credentialed, practicing administrator who is in contact with the faculty supervisor during the fieldwork experience. In most cases, the candidates perform one of the two field experiences in the district or school setting in which they work. The second field experience must be at a different site and at least one of the sites must have a diverse student population.

School Counseling candidates are involved in a school based field experience, supervised by school site personnel selected by the Program Coordinator and integrating the knowledge and skills from the coursework.

Available technology is integrated into the field experiences and documented through supervisor observation, course projects and assessments. Master Teachers, Faculty Supervisors and employers speak highly of the candidates' applied technology skills and knowledge, indicating that they serve as models of best practices for other teachers at the school sites.

Selection criteria used for Master Teachers are listed in the Program Handbook and include a minimum of three years of teaching experience, tenure in the school district, an on-going successful record of teaching excellence, current knowledge of subject matter methods,

willingness to share expertise, materials, and classroom duties with a student teacher and appropriate certification as well as the recommendation of the site administrator. Stakeholders indicate that when concerns are expressed about the qualifications and/or skills of a Master Teacher, the University Supervisor intervenes to ensure that the candidate has the opportunity to successfully complete the requirements of the student teaching experiences.

Master Teachers receive written notification of the program expectations for the field experiences and in the Single Subject Credential Program, a DVD has been piloted which highlights the role of a Master Teacher, the standards against which the candidate's performance will be measured, program information and contact information for the university supervisor. Feedback from stakeholders is very positive and the use of the DVD is being expanded to other programs.

C. Candidates' development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn

Field Experience Placements in 2007-2008

Program	Candidates Eligible for Clinical Practice
Multiple Subject Traditional Program	295
Multiple Subject Interns	118
Multiple Subject BCLAD	28
Multiple Subject Professional Development School at Greenfield Union School District	17
Single Subject Traditional	289
Single Subject Interns	93
Reading Certificate and/or Specialist	55
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Level I without Masters	66
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Level I with Masters	28
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Level I with Master Interns	57
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Level I without Masters	14
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Level I with Masters	3
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Level I with Masters Intern	21
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Level II without Masters	69
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Level II with Masters	49
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Level II without Masters	24
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Level II with Masters	19
Ed Admin Level I	164
Ed Admin Level I Interns	7
Ed Admin Level II	6
PPS Counseling with MS	73
PPS Counseling without MS	18
School Nurse Credential Only	5
School Nurse Credential and MS	11

Program leaders report that most candidates successfully complete the field experiences. In the past years there were a few candidates who needed to repeat the student teaching experience and a few that were counseled out of the profession.

Candidates are evaluated using a variety of assessments, including but not limited to portfolios, written reflections and observations. Integral components of the School of Education Unit Assessment System are signature assignments. Each program has identified a series of activities that are used to assess candidate fieldwork performance in both the basic and advanced programs.

The candidates participating in the various Multiple Subjects Programs are assessed using the Teaching Performance Assessment, a pilot project using one of the state approved models of assessment. The TPA includes a videotape of the candidate teaching and opportunities to reflect on the effectiveness of the lesson. University supervisors and site supervisors conduct formal and informal evaluations of candidates during their field experiences and clinical practices. Assessments are designed to evaluate candidates' ability to address the learning needs of a diverse student population.

The dispositions of candidates are evaluated in all programs based on a rubric at the beginning, middle and end of the program. Candidates who do not demonstrate proficiency are remediated by the faculty within the respective program.

Candidates are given many opportunities to reflect on their experiences. Self-evaluations, journals, portfolio entries and other types of reflections are included in the requirements for the various field experiences. Some programs have piloted the use of an electronic portfolio using the Live Text format.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit, in collaboration with its school partners, designs, implements and evaluates field experiences and clinical practices so that candidates at the initial and advanced levels have opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions identified in the unit's conceptual framework. Field experiences and clinical practice take place in diverse settings. Assessment and evaluations indicate that candidates meet professional and state standards.

Recommendation:

Initial: Met

Advanced: Met

Areas for Improvement:

New: None

Rationale:

Continued: None

Rationale:

Corrected: None

Rationale:

State Team Decision: Standard is Met

STANDARD 4. DIVERSITY

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences

A commitment to diversity is reflected in the unit's mission and vision statements, and in one of the six candidate dispositions. The unit's mission statement places a priority on preparing highly capable professionals to serve a culturally and linguistically diverse community with a sense of integrity. This aspect of the mission is drawn from the theme of caring, as demonstrated by: "acting on the basis of moral reasoning or social justice; showing compassion and/or empathy; and reaching out to others and making connections." The unit's vision statement includes the goal of becoming the leading unit in the California State University system in terms of faculty diversity, so that minority candidates might have role models and mentors having the same characteristics, especially for those who are first generation college students. Among the unit's six candidate dispositions is "ethical professional," which states that a "candidates actions are based on accepted professional standards of conduct and reflect insight and awareness with respect to diverse perspectives . . ." The conceptual framework describes the highly diverse characteristics of the community in which the unit is located, including not only ethnic, linguistic, and cultural minorities; there is also a high percentage of families in the area who are of low socioeconomic status, resulting in the unit having one of the highest percentage of first generation college students in the nation.

California law mandates the integration of diversity and meeting the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students in teacher education programs. While there is no single course required that is related to diversity, a variety of courses address diversity and include assignments and assessments that require candidates to gain and apply knowledge and skills related to diversity. The requirement is essentially met by students having to complete a certificate in cross-cultural language and academic development (CLAD) or bilingual cross-cultural language and academic development (BCLAD) demonstrating knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to teaching English language learners in the P-12 setting. Requirements for these certificate programs are integrated throughout initial programs.

There are numerous proficiencies related to diversity for which the candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate. A survey of course syllabi reveals several examples. In an introductory course on cross-cultural education, candidates must define key cultural and ethnic concepts, apply them to classroom settings, and describe multicultural elements of curricula and instruction. In a course on language acquisition and development, candidates are responsible for becoming knowledgeable in how to provide basic second language instruction, specifically by describing relevant factors of second language acquisition and creating and implementing plans for academic instruction in English. In an introductory class for teaching English language learners, candidates must develop and present a two-day series of lessons for various ESL strategies, addressing requirements for differentiation, motivational strategies, scaffolding, and instructional strategies to develop the students' language arts competencies. In a foundations course, candidates develop an appreciation of the multicultural diversity of American society in its educational endeavors and learn to engage in reflective thought concerning economic,

political, and cultural factors that affect education in society. (One graduate mentioned the profound impact this course had on her by raising her awareness of past, inappropriate treatment of minority students.) In a literacy course, candidates must learn to recognize linguistic and cultural bias in assessment instruments, use effective materials and instructional strategies that engage the strengths of the English Language learner's native language skills in bridging to English, and plan specific English language development lessons to enhance acquisition skills. In a special education course, candidates must select and use appropriate instructional materials and technologies and demonstrate the skills to plan, deliver and evaluate instruction to students with special needs, as well as knowing when and how to address social integration issues for these students within the general education setting.

Signature assignments in courses require candidates to demonstrate dispositions that value learning by all students. These assignments include case studies, lesson plans, and reflections. Feedback provided to candidates is considered valuable and provides them with opportunities to adjust and strengthen their instruction to facilitate student success. Candidates are regularly assessed during field experiences and clinical work on competencies related to working with diverse learners. Survey data from graduates report acceptable ranges of feeling well equipped or adequately equipped in meeting various needs of diverse learners by basic program graduates. For example, elementary candidates report such ratings at the following levels: 81%-99% (2005), 78%-96% (2006), and 72%-96% (2007), in. In advanced programs in elementary, secondary, and special education, similar assessments reveal ranges of 60%-100% for 2005.

B. Experiences working with diverse faculty

Candidates report that there are numerous opportunities to work with diverse faculty at the unit. The breakdown of diversity among institution faculty (a total of 537) is as follows: American Indian/Alaskan – 4; Asian/Pacific Islander - 50; African-American – 25; Hispanic – 52; Unspecified – 3; White – 403. While the diversity of the unit faculty does not parallel that of community or that of the candidates, there are minority faculty present in the unit. The table below describes the breakdown of the faculty by gender and ethnicity.

Table __: Current Faculty –Tenured, Tenure-Track, & Lectures by Ethnicity and Gender

Ethnicity	Advanced Education	Physical Education & Kinesiology	Special Education	Teacher Education	Total
Hispanic	7	0	1	1	9 (8%)
African American	1	0	1	2	4 (3.6%)
Native American	0	1	0	1	2 (1.8%)
Asian-American	2	1	3	3	9 (8%)
White	14	6	8	56	84 (75%)
Not specified	0	1	0	3	4 (3.6%)
TOTAL	24	9	13	66	112
Male	13	4	5	20	42 (37.5%)
Female	11	5	8	46	70 (62.5%)

TOTAL	24	9	13	66	112
-------	----	---	----	----	-----

The passage of Proposition 209 in California several years ago eliminated affirmative action in hiring and admission practices. Search committee chairs describe timing and cost as barriers to acquiring faculty members in general. Obtaining faculty lines can be problematic; once lines are available, the pool of potential candidates for faculty is less because many have taken positions elsewhere.

In the past four years, the unit has brought in two Hispanic and three White faculties (three women, two men). In recruiting minority and women faculty, unit resources have been authorized for announcements in various publications (Black Issues in Higher Education; Hispanic Outlook; Chronicle of Higher Education), in addition to individual faculty contacts, and information circulated at state, national, and international conferences and meetings.

C. Experiences working with diverse candidates

Candidates from the unit come from diverse racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. The table below shows one aspect of candidate diversity.

Table __: Percentages of all program completers by ethnicity for 2006

	Percentage of total completers
Non-resident alien	67 (5.8%)
African-American, non-Hispanic	57 (4.9%)
American Indian or Alaskan Native	15 (1.3%)
Asian or Pacific Islander	43 (3.7%)
Hispanic	214 (18.6%)
White, non-Hispanic	650 (56.3%)
Race/ethnicity unknown	107 (9.3%)
TOTAL	1153

Changes resulting from Proposition 209 have caused the unit to examine ways to attract teacher candidates from the local community, particularly among high school students. This is notable in that the area has the lowest rate of college attendance in the state and this has an impact is that the local economy is weakened.

The unit has created a “Council of Counselors” to seek input in addressing, among other things, the needs of potential teacher candidates and how these can be met within unit programs. The result of this collaboration was that the number of applications to the institution from targeted high school partners doubled during the second year of the initiative. The unit also partners with other components of the institution to work with the community to insure that minority candidates continue to enroll in teacher education programs. Early intervention programs for prospective college students, primarily targeted towards individuals from low socioeconomic levels, seek to minimize the number of students that require remedial coursework when they enter the university and lessen the possibility of becoming discouraged and dropping out. Another outreach program, designed to attract African American youth to become first generation college students, managed to result in an admittance rate of more than 90% of 150 individuals. Partnerships with local community colleges have been established allowing potential teacher candidates to be successful as they transition from the community college into teacher education programs.

These initiatives clearly demonstrate good-faith efforts to maintain a diverse population among the teacher candidate population.

D. Experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools

The highly diverse nature of the surrounding community is manifest in various ethnic, linguistic, and cultural minorities and a substantial percentage of students who qualify for free or reduced lunch. This characteristic provides candidates numerous opportunities to work with diverse P-12 students, including many English language learners, students of low socioeconomic status, and students with disabilities as they complete their coursework and field and clinical experiences. The table below demonstrates the diverse nature of the surrounding community.

Table__ : Kern County Educational Demographics/Enrollments 2005/2006

American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Pacific Islander	Filipino	Hispanic or Latino	African American	White (not Hispanic)	Multiple or no response
0.8 %	2.0 %	0.2 %	1.7 %	54.4 %	6.9 %	32.3 %	1.6 %

Of the 170,632 students enrolled in surrounding county public schools during the 2005-2006 school year, approximately 20% of the students were English language learners representing more than 20 language groups; the vast majority of these (95.5%) were Spanish speakers.

Initial candidates report that they have many opportunities through their field placements to work with students of diverse backgrounds and that their coursework requires them to do so. These interactions allow them to gain experience in developing strategies for improving student learning through instruction, reflection upon their teaching, and making needed adjustments necessary for their students to achieve success. As an example of this, one White teacher candidate incorporated cultural information into a lesson she taught after a student told her about a Punjabi holiday his family observed. Almost all of the advanced candidates report that they are employed in the schools and thus work with diverse students on a daily basis.

There are various opportunities for teacher candidates to engage in part-time employment that brings them into contact with diverse P-12 students. Candidates in the Greenfield Professional Development School described a program named Fast Track, in which they were hired to help low-achieving students improve their skills in literacy. They expressed how significant this opportunity was for them in terms of gaining additional training and feeling more prepared to work in the classroom once they were engaged in clinical practice. Other opportunities were available for candidates to work part-time or complete field experiences in two early childhood centers housed in a half-way house programs for women recently released from incarceration and in a homeless shelter.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit designs and implements curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse unit faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 settings. Candidates interact in classroom settings on campus and in the community with unit and clinical faculty and other candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups. Education projects related to education and content areas, field experiences, and clinical practice prepare candidates to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds, including students with

exceptionalities. Feedback from peers and supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to improve instruction and help all students learn.

Recommendation:

Met at Initial and Advanced Levels

Areas for Improvement: None

State Team Decision: Standard is Met

STANDARD 5. FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Qualified faculty

Currently there are a total of 34 tenure and tenure-track faculty positions in the unit. Of these positions, 53% are tenured and 45% are tenure-track. They account for 62% of the full-time equivalent faculty. Full-time and part-time faculty lecturers total 19.27 full-time equivalent faculty. Of these positions 10 full time equivalent faculty are full-time lecturers. temporary and part time temporary.

The following table shows an accounting of faculty numbers by number of tenured, tenure- track, full time temporary and part time temporary.

All tenured and tenure-track faculty in the unit hold either a Ph.D. or Ed.D in their field of expertise. They have past experience in public schools, institutions of higher education, on-going research, community service, publications and/or other professional activities. Three full-

A/Y	Tenured Faculty	Tenure Track Faculty	Full-time Temp Faculty	Part-time Temp Faculty
2006/07	26	13	4	107
2005/06	30	18	6	122
2004/05	25	17	6	109
2003/04	24	16	10	150
2002/03	23	20	9	168

time lecturers hold terminal degrees.

The remaining full- and part-time lecturers all hold master's degrees. The expertise that qualifies the full-time and part-time lecturers is extensive teaching experience in their field and they have demonstrated competence in their assigned roles. Faculty vitae indicate that they are currently employed or recently retired from professional positions in PreK-12 partner districts. The faculty hiring committee makes the determination as to whether a person is qualified for a position in the unit.

The unit works closely with district partners to ensure that school faculty are licensed in the areas they teach and are supervising. The requirements for clinical faculty are spelled out in the Master Teachers-MS Program Handbook. They are required to have a minimum of three years teaching experience in their subject area and must be recommended by their school site administration. They must be appropriately licensed in their field, have tenure in the district,

have an ongoing record of excellent teaching, and meet state and federal requirements for being considered highly qualified.

B. Modeling best professional practices in teaching

Interviews with faculty revealed that they believe and understand the conceptual framework and they model the dispositions in their attitudes toward candidates, their instruction, and the teaching profession. They stated that many of the comments and feedback given to candidates relate to the conceptual framework.

Many of the faculty members are engaged in research and service activities which involve candidates. Faculty stay current by reading current research which they bring into class discussions and recommend reading for candidates. Faculty regularly update their syllabi to incorporate current knowledge in their respective fields.

One of the unit candidate dispositions states that “candidates are reflective, life long learners who apply problem solving and critical thinking strategies . . .” Interviews with faculty indicate that they are mindful of this disposition and engage in teaching which will develop this disposition in candidates. Faculty use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and professional dispositions. Syllabi show that candidates in all programs are required to reflect. Candidates are required to maintain a journal of field experiences in which they reflect on the effectiveness of their observations and their own teaching. Other examples candidates gave include reflection of faculty lectures, assigned reading, and case studies. Advanced candidates said reflection has become a part of their regular practice in their own classrooms.

Candidates gave the following examples of faculty teaching that developed critical thinking and problem solving skills; analyzing case studies, reflecting on best practices in order to improve teaching, analyzing research based instruction and deciding which strategy would work best in a given case scenario. Candidates believe that because faculty model professional dispositions candidates learn these dispositions. Interviews revealed that candidates know the unit dispositions and strive not only to pass the unit disposition assessment but to incorporate them into their own practice.

Modeling best practice is central to what occurs in the classroom at CSUB. Many faculty members throughout the unit have received local, state, and national recognition for teaching. The California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the National Board Certification of Teachers Core Propositions are used in program courses. Syllabi and interviews with faculty indicate that the following instructional strategies are modeled; lecture, class discussion, small group activities, collaboration, observation sharing and synthesis of findings, scaffolding, peer help, prompts in problem solving, and the Socratic method of answering questions with probing questions.

Interviews with faculty members and candidates revealed that faculty are knowledgeable of current research-based instruction. Candidates were able to name researchers and discuss instructional strategies.

Faculty model the creation of rubrics for assessment. Students are involved in the creation of many of the rubrics. Faculty discuss the format of assessment with candidates and they show

candidates how to write clear directions not only as prescribed in a specific course curriculum, they but also discuss assessment when assessing knowledge in other courses.

In discussions with faculty members it is apparent that they have broad knowledge and experience in diversity. Not only do faculty members have past experience, but diversity is obvious in many of the service and collaboration activities in which they are currently involved. Whenever appropriate in their content area, they bring their knowledge and experience into class discussions. Faculty members see themselves as advocates for all groups of candidates and school children. They stay current with research in the area of diversity. It is important to them that all students feel comfortable in class.

When discussing diversity issues candidates said that faculty members were able to share examples from their own experience. Faculty are able to support their instruction with stories of their experiences with diversity in the classroom. They were able to show candidates real examples of differentiated instruction and how to prepare lesson plans for all types of students they will encounter in a classroom.

Most program faculty are specialists in instructional technology. Candidates use WebCT, LifeText e-portfolios, submit assignment on line, participate in on line forums, and use the Internet for research. Hybrid courses meet face to face, online, and ITV. Faculty across the unit use PowerPoint, databases, spreadsheets, the Internet and authorizing computer technology within their courses. Faculty encourage candidates to share their knowledge of technology whenever appropriate through class discussions and class assignments and projects.

Interviews with candidates revealed that faculty know and share Internet based resources, web based research sites, and show candidates how to identify site integrity. They are also taught to use hardware such as smartboards. Candidates are expected to apply their knowledge of technology in order to make decisions about how technology will improve classroom instruction.

One of the primary measures of teaching in the faculty evaluation process is the student evaluation. The survey is administered after each course. A review of current Student Opinionnaire of Courses and Instruction surveys consistently show that candidates believe the instruction they receive is of high quality. Interviews with candidates revealed that most candidates believe the quality of teaching is extremely high. They said the faculty had high standards and high expectations not only for themselves, but also for candidates.

Self-assessment is encouraged by the unit. One part of the faculty evaluation calls for written reflections on the Student Opinionnaire of Courses and Instruction. Interviews with faculty revealed that they analyze the student opinionnaires and make improvements in their teaching based on the survey. Some faculty members reported surveying candidates during the course so that adjustments could be made to improve teaching immediately instead of waiting until the next time the course is taught. Faculty routinely update their syllabi and make modifications to their courses based on their own integration of current knowledge from the field.

C. Modeling best professional practices in scholarship

As part of the institution's mission, faculty members are expected to participate in scholarly work that contributes to their field. This includes research that is conducted and published, presentations at conferences, writing and being awarded grants, writing and/or contributing to books, and writing journal articles.

Unit annual reports and faculty vita reveal that the types of scholarship activities in which faculty are involved include; research, applied research, authoring books, book chapters, refereed publications, journal articles, manuscript reviewers of textbooks, conference presenters, and planning and organizing conferences.

The following table summarizes the faculty participation in scholarship over the past three years.

	Publications	Presentations	Grants and Contracts
Local	9	15	26
State	4	25	4
National	45	40	10
International	5	13	2
TOTAL	63	93	42

All faculty in the unit are expected to share knowledge through classroom teaching from scholarship and present at local, state, and national conferences. Faculty model the process of research by engaging students in research projects associated with course offerings. Undergraduates work as student assistants with faculty who are conducting research.

Percentage of the Unit's Faculty Are Engaged in Scholarship

Department	n	Number Involved	Percentage Involved
AES	9	8	81
PEAK	2	2	100
SPED	5	5	100
TED	13	13	100
TOTAL			97%

D. Modeling best professional practices in service

Faculty are expected to participate in service activities within the unit, within the institution, and in the community. Evidence shows that faculty are extremely involved in a wide variety of service activities. The following is a partial list of service activities in which faculty members participate. This list is a summary of data taken faculty interviews and from the Program Annual Report to the Provost for each program in the unit. Within the unit, faculty serve on the RTP Committee, Graduate Studies in Education Curriculum Committee, Teacher Education Advisory Committee, SOE Technology Committee, Budget Committee, Assessment Committee, School Advisory Council,

Within the unit, faculty made presentations at the Teaching and Learning Center, University RTP Committee, CSUB Taskforce on the Evaluation of Teaching and Teaching Methods, Disabilities Service Advisory Committee, CSU-NASA Education Collaborative

Faculty are serve on the following local boards and advisory committees; Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment, Intern Consortium, County Curriculum Advisory Committee, Rosewood Retirement Community Board, Reading Clinic at a middle school, CA Science Education Consortium, International Reading Association, Organization for Women in Higher Education, California Sports Authority, and a faculty member translated construction documents for a local construction company.

Percentage of the Faculty Actively Involved in Service Activities

Department	n	Number Involved	Percent Involved
AES	11	9	81%
PEAK	2	2	100%
SPED	5	5	100%
TED	16	12	75%
TOTAL	34	28	82%

E. Collaboration

The following table shows the faculty collaboration with colleagues in PreK-12 schools, other units at the institution, and the boarder professional community. All 33 faculty members participate in collaboration. The following table shows the duplicated count of faculty collaboration over the past three years.

Advanced Education (n=11)	Physical Education (n=2)	Special Education (n=5)	Teacher Education (n=15)
PreK-12	PreK-12	PreK-12	PreK-12
19	4	26	37
UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY
37	0	5	28
COMMUNITY	COMMUNITY	COMMUNITY	COMMUNITY
19	5	21	20

Faculty are required to actively participate in public elementary or secondary schools and classrooms at least once every three academic years. Collaboration with colleagues in P-12 schools is evidenced in the unit's support of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment; the Our Teachers Our Future Conference, the Teaching with New Technologies Program, the Bakersfield Homeless Center Project, the Foster Youth Services Tutoring Program, the Bakersfield Adult School Advisory Board, the Children's Art Institute, and providing classroom aides for the Summer Ready to Start Reading Program in local schools.

Faculty collaboration has provided ways for faculty members to see the needs in public schools and change their curriculum to incorporate what candidates will need to be successful in these schools. First hand knowledge of the local schools enables faculty to bring rich, relevant examples for class discussions and help students implement theory into practice.

F. Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance

According to the faculty handbook and interviews faculty are evaluated in three principal areas; (a) teaching success, which is the principle requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. (b) Scholarly/creative activity of high quality that has received favorable peer review in the discipline and may include, but not be limited to, research and publication; and (c) Professionally related services to the discipline, the institution and the community.

The first year evaluation is only at the unit level. For subsequent evaluations faculty are required to prepare and maintain a RTP file. This documentation includes reviews and reflections of Student Opinionnaires of Courses and Instruction, course syllabi, course materials, and other measures of teaching such as an introspective self-assessment, peer assessments, and/or formal assessments done by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center.

The department Retention Tenure and Promotion Committee reviews the file and makes a recommendation to the dean. The dean evaluates the recommendation and the file and makes a recommendation to the University Review Committee (URC) which is made up of six institution faculty members. The role of the URC is to make sure due process, institution policies, and procedures are followed. They conduct an independent evaluation when there is a discrepancy between the recommendations of the department RTP committee and the dean. The recommendation is passed to the Provost who reviews it and makes a recommendation to the president. The president makes the final decision as to retention, and tenure. Faculty members are permitted to write a rebuttal to decisions made at any level of this process.

All tenure-track, full- and part-time faculty reviews take place in years 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 of their probationary period. Tenured faculty are evaluated on a five year cycle at intervals of no greater than 5 years. Full- and part-time faculty are evaluated on teaching only. There are no graduate teaching assistants in the unit. Faculty within the unit generally perform well on the unit's evaluation.

Evaluations are used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service in providing feedback after the review. Faculty peers, department chairs, and dean are available to discuss ways for the faculty to engage in activities to improve their performance. Faculty who are performing at less than acceptable levels are encouraged to conference with their department chair. A plan of remediation is developed. The Faculty Teaching and Learning Center is also available to help faculty.

G. Unit facilitation of professional development

A review of professional development and travel expense claim forms reveals that the professional development in which faculty participate is related to the research on which they are evaluated.

Brown bag lunch meetings are arranged for faculty to share professional development activities in which they have been involved. Topics have included Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment, No Child Left Behind legislation, and travel experiences of faculty. The Faculty Teaching and Learning Center offers workshops to assist faculty in the preparation of materials for performance assessment, hour-long as well as multi-day workshops, symposia on pedagogy, video conferences featuring nationally recognized experts, and a series of small grant programs. Evidence in the document room shows that faculty attend conferences and seminars on technology, diversity, emerging practices, and many other aspects of teaching and learning.

Evidence shows that faculty are regularly and continually engaging in professional development activities both on and off campus. Not only do faculty attend and/or present at conferences they share their experiences with their colleagues and candidates.

Overall Assessment of Standard

All tenure and tenure-track faculty hold terminal degrees. Faculty members have extensive experience in school settings. They are effective teachers who model best practice. The scholarly work in which they are engaged advances candidate knowledge and the profession. Faculty provide education related service to the local community. Collaboration with unit faculty, institution faculty, local schools, and other education professionals is engaged in to improve teaching and learning. The unit has a regular and systematic procedure for evaluating faculty performance and provides professional development opportunities to improve teaching.

Recommendation: Met at Initial and Advanced Levels

Areas for Improvement: None

State Team Decision: Standard is Met

STANDARD 6. UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Level: (Initial and/or Advanced)

A. Unit leadership and authority

1. The responsibility of the unit rests with the dean who is head of the unit. This includes the oversight of planning, delivery and operation of the programs of study designed to meet state standards and the unit mission and conceptual framework. The School of Education (SOE) is within the division of Academic Affairs led by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

An associate dean position has not been filled since vacancy occurred in 2006. The SOE has several committees that assist in the operation of the unit. Key committees consist of the Curriculum Committee, Graduate Studies Committee, Department Chair Committee, the School Academic Council, Program Coordinators Committee, Assessment Committee, and the Teacher Education Advisory Committee. Each committee has a separate charge but some overlap in their duties.

At this point, the role of the School Academic Council is not clearly understood by many faculty.

2. As noted previously there are many faculty committees that participate in the operations of the unit. Curricular decisions begin at the faculty level and are approved by the programs. After program approval, curricular changes are reviewed by the curriculum committee and then move on to the dean. If the changes are of a substantive nature, the Teacher Education Advisory Committee will review them. Finally, the entire faculty will have the opportunity to approve curricular changes that come from the SOE. There is a heavy emphasis on community personnel from local Bakersfield school districts but not as much from branch campuses.
3. The local school district, superintendent's office, principals and teachers are involved in program operations. They take part in advisory committee work, attend workshops and are a part of the life of the unit.

The unit utilizes including committees, newsletters, posted minutes, retreats and workshops. The dean is very involved communicating the operations of the unit. Mechanisms include chair meetings, the School Academic Council, Program Coordinators who meet regularly, the Assessment Committee, the Accreditation Leadership Committee, the Teacher Education Advisory Council, the Graduate Studies Committee, and the Budget Committee. The Teacher Education Advisory Council in particular involves many members of the community and stands as a model for university and community relationship structures.

4. Candidates have access to student services as communicated through college and university websites, catalog and advisory communications. Some question remains, however, concerning the consistency of high quality advising across all school majors and locations. This concern specifically focuses upon single subject candidates where it appears that most students are assigned to one advisor regardless of their home campus. Lack of clear leadership, communication, and coordination creates misunderstandings and inconsistencies in information for candidates within some programs. Evidence indicates varying levels of misinformation, confusion, how to obtain course waivers, how to solve problems in the preliminary state, stage I and II. Candidates also report difficulty getting placed at school sites for both observation and student teaching phases. Single subject credential faculty, program supervisors, candidates, and graduates report a lack of knowledge and understanding of the content and purpose of signature assignments and candidate dispositions.
5. The course catalog and websites from the SOE clearly describe the programs including admission policies and program information. Candidates can obtain information from either of these two sources or from calling evaluators, credential analysts or faculty members listed on the web site.
6. Calendar, catalog, publications and grading policies appear to be accurate and current. They are updated regularly and are easily accessible

B. Unit Budget

1. While the unit budget appears to be proportional to other units on campus significant reductions in budget may present serious problems for an already minimally funded set of programs and call into questions plans for future programs including an Ed.D. Class size adjustments may bring some relief to the press on resources, but are unlikely to cover all needs.

A review of the Antelope Valley budget appears also to be in order. Given the return on investment into this branch campus site, and the proportion of FTES earned on those resources, reallocation analysis may yield a prudent response to the budget reductions expected for 2008/2009.

2. The unit has maintained a \$5000 "Intellectual Vitality Fund." In addition there are other competitive grants available. However there are limited resources for SOE faculty. Given the severe budget challenges facing the unit, the professional development resources may be at risk. This problem is especially pointed for junior faculty about to undergo tenure and promotion review.

C. Personnel

1. The unit's workload for faculty is governed by the California State University System contract with the faculty union. A 12 Weighted Teaching Units (as defined by contract between the California State University System and the California Faculty Association) teaching load is provided, with an additional 3 Weighted Teaching Units to cover service and scholarship commitments. Since the time of the last unit review, unit leadership monitors faculty load more carefully. At the same time, however, there is some evidence to support the contention that faculty often volunteer to teach unpaid overloads in order to fulfill the program's obligation to provide timely service to graduate students in a timely fashion.

2. Supervision appears to be fulfilled through a combination of full-time and part-time faculty utilization. It is unclear at this time the extent to which all supervising faculty are qualified. Supervision responsibilities may be complicated further with current and expected budget reductions that place greater demands on full-time faculty to teach core classes.
3. Workload within the unit is highly variable dependent upon the department. Maintenance of the balance between fulfilling Student Credit Hour targets for the school, and Student Faculty Ratio appropriate for the discipline and type of instruction appropriate to that department remains a challenge.

While the California State University contract makes available 3 Weighted Teaching Units conceptually available for scholarship and service in addition to a 12 Weighted Teaching Units teaching load, the current budget environment will stress the capacity of the faculty to provide the highest quality of performance. The development of curriculum responses to the changing needs of the service region, the transformation of existing and development of new online courses, service to the region's teachers and administrators, and the scholarly development of faculty require a level of support, the source of which is unclear at this time.

4. There is limited use of part-time faculty as many full-time faculty travel to other sites to deliver programs. Full-time faculty report that they work with part-time faculty to ensure they are offering the same program. Common syllabi are used and full-time faculty meet regularly with part-time faculty to ensure coherence.
5. The evaluator's and credential analyst's offices are short-staffed and often cover receptionist duties for each other. The administrative assistant in the dean's office is regularly called upon to produce assessment data reports.

D. Unit facilities

1. Classroom, office and library facilities are adequate. Information technology for instruction is adequate.

E. Unit resources including technology

1. Since it is clear that the proportion of external funding necessary for the support of operations will grow, investment into external grants and contracts will have to increase. Policies that incentivize faculty grant and contracts work need to be developed.
2. Faculty and students go through California Technology Assistance Project training via a cooperative agreement with local school district. The level of training available to faculty and the level of use for online course design and delivery is unclear. As the unit reports itself, "Funding for technology is not plentiful in this time of CSU-Systemwide budget shortfalls." At this time, the School of Education appears to be largely dependent upon one faculty member for its IT needs. How long that faculty member can continue in that capacity with a full teaching load, in addition to program management and IT consulting for the school remains unclear.

3. The evaluators and credential analysts are able to offer assistance in the operation of the assessment system. Program coordinators often complete their own analysis or obtain assistance from the dean's office. The unit employs LiveText as an important part of its data management system. This complements the SOE Eight-Point Assessment System.
4. With the hiring of a dedicated librarian for the Antelope Valley campus, library needs of faculty and students in that location appear to have been well addressed. Library access to hard copy and online resources appears adequate.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit meets Standard 6 requirements relative to leadership and authority, budget, personnel workloads, facilities, technological and other resources. Areas for improvement calling for clarification are cited.

Recommendation: Met at Initial and Advanced Levels

Areas for Improvement:

New: Management responsibility and the meaning of shared government are unclear among faculty.

Rationale: The unit needs to clarify lines of authority and management responsibilities between all levels of unit governance. The role of the School Academic Council is particularly unclear and should be reviewed by faculty and administration.

Revised and Continued:

Formerly: The student advising system is inadequate.

Current: The student advising system is inadequate in some programs. Develop, implement and monitor a student advising program.

Rationale: Quality advising services have been identified as a need for programs for single subjects and special education by students. The issue is difficulty in securing timely and accurate information.

Removed:

The Unit does not ensure that a sufficient number of full-time faculty are available to supervise field experiences and teach courses.

Rationale: We find that the unit's use of part-time faculty is not excessive or inappropriate

Removed:

Instructional resource materials are not available to support the off-campus programs.

Rationale: With the advent of the Internet and its wide use the access to resource materials at off campus sites was not identified as a problem.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with Concerns*Rationale:*

Insufficient leadership and coordination in Single Subject and Special Education programs result in lack of understanding of program design, assessment, advisement and field experiences by candidates and faculty. Single subject candidates fail to recognize signature assignments and are unfamiliar with candidate dispositions. Differential allocation of faculty workload and field supervision are also evident. (Common Standard 1)

Candidates in Single Subject and Special Education programs report inconsistency in advisement. Different requirements are articulated by different University personnel, and candidates are unclear as to which to believe and follow. Candidates rely on each other, rather than University personnel because institutional personnel give conflicting information (Common Standard 6).

California Issues in Internship Programs

There are internships in Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist M/M and M/S, and Educational Administration.

Common Standards 1 – Leadership

Each district works with the institution to provide support in the operation of the programs.

Common Standards 2 –Resources

The districts provide the required resources to the intern candidates.

Common Standard 4 – Evaluation

The partner districts participated in the development and implementation of the assessment system.

Common Standard 5 – Admission

Admission criteria included prior experiences and personal qualifications for all interns.

Common Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance

In the Special Education programs there are inconsistencies in the effective coordination between the faculty and coordinators at Bakersfield and Antelope Valley. At the Antelope Valley satellite program coordination is collaborative and consultative among the faculty, students, and school districts. At Bakersfield this level of coordination lacks consistency.

In other programs the institution provides assistance to those that need it and retains only those that are qualified. Qualified individuals provide advice and assistance to the interns. The faculty develop an individual plan for the mentoring support and professional development of each intern.

Common Standard 7 – School Collaboration

There is collaboration in the selection of district supervisors, the placement of interns, and the shaping and evaluation of the internship assignments.

Common Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors

The interns receive support from one or more supervisors who are assigned to the intern. The supervisors are trained, oriented to the support role and evaluated.

Multiple Subject Credential Program
Multiple Subject Internship Credential Program
Multiple Subjects: BCLAD Emphasis

Findings on Standards:

After reviewing the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Multiple Subject Credential Programs.

The Multiple Subject Program at CSUB is well-organized, and candidates and graduates both commented that they enjoyed high levels of support at all stages of the program. In particular, the half-day and full-day structure of student teaching provides excellent opportunities for candidates to work extensively with a diverse student population and experienced master teachers. The structure of the program is designed to be completed in sequence. This sequence is clear to candidates, and they reported that as they progressed through the program, their knowledge and skills grew. Faculty are passionate about their work, and clearly committed to the candidates' success as teachers, and to children's learning in schools.

The Multiple Subject Program, including the BCLAD and Intern Program, is offered in four locations: on the main campus of CSUB, Antelope Valley, College of the Canyons (Santa Clarita), and at a Professional Development School in the Greenfield Union School District. The programs are aligned, similar and cohesive. Coordinators collaborate on a regular basis. Communication is outstanding among coordinators, students, and staff.

Strengths in Program Implementation:

The Multiple Subject Program is to be lauded for its collaboration with local school districts and the County Offices of Education. This was clearly evident in the wide participation of Assistant Superintendents, County Office administrators, school site principals, and BTSA Induction Program Coordinators on advisory councils (TEAC and CEPAC) and in fieldwork coordination. This collaboration has been in place for years, and has supported extensive changes in program requirements. It has also allowed the university to respond to local educational needs.

Another area of strength for the Multiple Subject program is the Professional Development School model which is highly structured and firmly in place in the Greenfield Union School District. The cohort of candidates completes coursework and fieldwork at a school site, and their experience is positive and productive.

The para-professional cohort in Arvin demonstrates CSUB's ability and willingness to meet the educational needs of an outlying service area. The cohort program provides courses leading to the Multiple Subject Credential for paraeducators in the region, and may be a model that can be used successfully in other districts.

In addition, the College of the Canyons cohort is recognized for its organization, leadership, and high quality of service and support to the candidates.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation:

None

Single Subject Credential Program

Single Subject Credential Internship Program

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Single Subject Program except for the following which were met with concerns:

- Standard 1(f) Program Design: Single subject credential program faculty, program supervisors, candidates, and graduates report a lack of knowledge and understanding of the content and purpose of signature assignments and candidate dispositions.
- Standard 2(c and d) Collaboration in Governing the Program: Lack of clear leadership, communication, and coordination creates misunderstandings and inconsistencies in information for candidates.
- Standard 9(a, b, d, and f) Using Computer-based Technology in the Classroom: Candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, and faculty report a lack of knowledge and experience with current technology such as grading programs, Elmo projectors, and Smart boards.
- Standard 15(a) Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork: Candidates and cooperating teachers report a need for more real-life experiences in management of instruction such as how to maintain a grade book, how to take attendance, how and when to fill out a referral form, how to interpret test results and how to conduct a parent conference.
- Standard 16(a) Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Fieldwork Supervisors: Candidates also report difficulty getting placed at school sites for both the observation and student teaching phases. Fieldwork sites are not purposefully selected based on the effectiveness of observed teaching and learning.

Faculty in the California State University, Bakersfield School of Education encourage all students to adhere to high standards of professional conduct through course syllabi, classroom activities and personal models. Reflective journals and online portfolios allow the students to assess their professional growth. Students build a sense of community through classroom presentations, sample lessons, and discussion of peer comments. The core values guiding the teacher preparation program are reflected in the course work and field experiences.

The Single Subject Credential program has an excellent process for preparing candidates for a preliminary credential. Students are given immediate feedback on their progress and assistance in improving their pedagogical skills. All candidates meet with the placement coordinator to understand the required documentation in preparation for their student teaching. Procedures are in place to assist candidates who are not ready to move on to student teaching.

Candidates are assigned to student teaching and their progress is assessed regularly by their university supervisor.

Strengths in Program Implementation:

The attention given to the competency of credential candidates prior to being placed in schools for student teaching is a definite strength.

Graduates and candidates in the Single Subject credential program described their program as a positive experience and felt confident and well prepared to enter their student teaching assignments.

Candidates, graduates, faculty and local school district personnel reflect enthusiasm and praise of the California State University, Bakersfield Single Subject credential program.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation:

No additional areas

**Education Specialist Credential Programs:
Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe: Level I and Level II
Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Level I Internship Credential**

Findings on the Standards:

Based on the institution's responses to the appropriate program standards, interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, supervising practitioners, University administrators, employers, the team finds the following: All standards are fully met for both the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Level I and Level II programs, except for Standard 9 in both programs and Standard 19 in the Moderate/Severe Level II program.

Standard 9 in the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Level I Programs are Met with Concerns. There are inconsistencies in the effective coordination between the faculty and coordinators at Bakersfield and Antelope Valley. At the Antelope Valley satellite program coordination is collaborative and consultative among the faculty, students, and school districts. At Bakersfield this level of coordination lacks consistency.

Standard 19 in Moderate/Severe Level II program is Met with Concerns. It is noted that the Level II programs for the Mild/Moderate and the Moderate/Severe programs are identical. Many of the standards overlap but Standard 19, an advanced curriculum standard, is unique to the Moderate/Severe program. The program curriculum lacks a robust range of multiple opportunities to develop leadership skills and the ability to manage and coordinate educational programs. Moderate/Severe candidates acknowledged that the program did not provide sufficient opportunities in the areas of leadership and management skills.

Strengths in Program Implementation:

Preparation: Current candidates and graduates concur that the program coursework provided prepare them for employment in their current school setting. Candidates and employers felt that the program graduates were well prepared to serve students of diverse backgrounds, varying language and cognitive abilities, and special needs.

Faculty: Candidates, school district administrators, and staff report that the Antelope Valley campus faculty was accessible, knowledgeable, and supportive. In addition the faculty was seen as part of the greater community that could be consulted after the graduates left the program.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation:

Mild/Moderate: Faculty report having to use outdated instructional and assessment materials, such as standardized tests and it is apparently due to resource allocation issues.

Moderate/Severe: School district professionals are pleased with student preparation, yet emphasized that candidate preparation include more current best practices in areas related to students with moderate/severe disabilities. The two areas of most concern are instructional strategies for students with emotional and/or behavioral disabilities and autism. In addition, candidates should have more opportunities to use appropriate and safe techniques, procedures, materials and adaptive equipment, including the use of technology.

Reading Language Arts Certificate and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Findings on Standards: After review of the institutional report, the program report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and Advisory Committee, the team determined that all program standards were met for both the Reading Certificate and for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential.

Strengths in Program Implementation:

Program Design and Content: The program has a cohesive design with both rich, clinical experiences and robust course assignments. Syllabi were clear about course expectations and the standards being addressed. Candidates and graduates stated that course content was balanced in theories related to reading and language, but more specifically, several individuals said that the program gave them strategies and ideas that could be used immediately in their classrooms. They felt that the coursework had provided opportunities for individualized and in depth analysis of the curriculum which enhanced and enriched what they had learned in their basic credential programs. In essence, the program gives an advanced perspective on reading and language arts. Courses are offered to meet the needs of working professionals. Students said that they appreciated the hybrid on-line courses that save time, but also they emphasized the importance of coming to campus twice monthly for personal interactions with the members of their cohort.

Program Faculty: All program courses are taught by tenured or tenure line faculty. Candidates and graduates state uniformly that they are motivated to produce work to a high standard due to the expectations of the faculty. Faculty is responsive to students' needs and suggestions. One group of students reported a problem and individuals in the next cohort said that the problem had been addressed and solved. This is only one example of several of the responsiveness of the faculty to the students. Faculty is accessible and they have fostered a spirit of community.

Field Experiences: One of the dispositions for students is to develop collaborative relationships. The field experiences involve participation in a clinic each year of the two-year program. First year program candidates are mentored by candidates who are in the second year of the program. The mentoring process is well designed for feedback both to the mentor and the mentee. Having this type of assignment gives the candidates experience in consultative and collaborative practices that will be part of their job as Reading and Language Arts Specialists.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation:

Students verified that they were exposed to a wide variety of theories in the areas of reading and language. However, it would be beneficial to provide an overview of the program's theoretical and scholarly underpinnings.

A candidate suggested that "shadowing" a reading specialist would be helpful in learning about the responsibilities of the position. This type of experience would very relevant and improve candidates' knowledge as practitioners.

One of the program's Five Year Goals is to expand the Literacy Program Committee (LitPac) to include candidates. In addition, the LitPac Committee proceedings should be reported and achieved. This would provide longitudinal information about the needs of and recommendations from the committee constituents.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Preliminary Administrative Services Internship Credential Professional Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards

After reviewing the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, faculty, employers, mentors, Advisory Committee members and field supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Credential and Professional Administrative Services Credential.

The program candidates are exposed to current learning theories and required to develop critical thinking skills making them consumers of research, policy, legal and the business management aspects of school administration. Current technologies are incorporated into a variety of programs and course offerings. Fieldwork is made relevant by a combination of student selection and faculty monitored experiences.

Strengths in Program Implementation

- The professionalism and accessibility of the program faculty and staff in supporting program candidates was consistently praised by all program candidates and graduates.
- Partnerships are well established between all aspects of the program and the communities they serve as evidenced by community input, involvement and responsiveness to program outcomes.
- Quality assessment is administered to candidates in all courses and through a culminating final examination process as supported by the triangulation of written, verbal and documented evidence.

Areas of Growth in Program Implementation

While evidence indicates that the Fieldwork standard is met, fieldwork could be strengthened by regular on-site visits from program faculty. In addition, some candidates mentioned that increased frequency of course offerings would facilitate completion of the program in a timely basis.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Counseling

Findings on Standards

All standards have been met in the Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program which authorizes practice in School Counseling. These findings were based on a review of several components including; the program document, documentation provided in the team room, and interviews with all program stakeholders including faculty, candidates, graduates, community and school based advisory members, employers, school district personnel, and university administrators.

Interviews with students and graduates of the program, faculty members, support staff in the public schools served by the university, indicate mastery in both the cognitive and affective domains. Integration of theories and research-based practices aligned with content standards was evidenced throughout the program. Faculty members in the program were viewed as supportive toward common goals and their dedication toward student success was very apparent. A team approach, led by a very competent and dedicated program coordinator, also brought about a high degree of success. Feedback for program improvement from internal and external sources was requested and received which helped to produce positive programmatic outcomes.

Candidate competence is a high priority and measurements to ensure professionalism are made using various strategies including: exams, research papers, and observations, both internal and external, by faculty and supervisors. Field based experiences are integrated throughout the program.

Strengths in Program Implementation

The faculty in the Counseling Program are praised and admired by candidates, graduates and employers and many accolades were made regarding their professionalism. Candidates and graduates were able to articulate their appreciation for receiving a strong foundation in academic content which was always supported with warmth and care.

Support for cultural diversity was very evident in the selection of candidates and graduates with a high percentage of program participants that are reflective of a multicultural environment. Cultural diversity was also articulated in course content and fieldwork assignments.

Fieldwork sites are carefully selected and candidates are assigned to various locations depending on their individual and unique needs. Fieldwork supervisors interviewed were very supportive and provided exceptional expertise for CSUB candidates.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation:

The majority of the fieldwork program components are excellent; however, fieldwork supervisors need additional training regarding the evaluation requirements for fieldwork candidates.

Additional allocation of time and support for the program coordinator would enhance the quality of the Counseling Program.

Professional School Nurse Health Services Credential Program

Findings on Standards

After reviewing the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the School Nurse Credential Program.

Strengths in Program Implementation

- The school nurse candidates and leadership reflect enthusiasm and mutual support for the program.
- Recently reorganized, the program now combines the Credential with MSN, revealing consistent program design, rationale and organization.
- Program development, extensive on-going evaluation and institutional support are integrated and are strengths of this program.
- Program information and advisement are consistently available to candidates.
- Qualified campus faculty and field preceptors are experienced, knowledgeable and supportive to the many learning activities.
- Program and individual evaluation is ongoing and remediation offered as needed.
- Crosscultural, diverse and vulnerable populations are researched and experienced.
- Texts are current while periodicals and on-line resources are available within the nursing facility.
- Faculty and candidates attend professional meetings and community activities enhancing the CSUB-community relationships.
- Candidates are employed as school nurses while enrolled in the credential program which presently accounts for the small enrollment. They provide health care, education and wellness to school communities building strong collaborations with school districts. Candidates express that what they learn and do in the credential program is relevant and applicable in their daily school nurse activities.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation

As already identified by the program coordinator, it is critical to maintain the school nursing program's high standards in assessment of candidates, recruitment of faculty, class content, and sensitivity to community needs.